



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,284	06/26/2006	Shuichi Masuzoe	Q95618	4087
23373 7590 02/26/2009 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
COLON SANTANA, EDUARDO				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2837				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/26/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/584,284

Applicant(s)

MASUZOE, SHUICHI

Examiner

Eduardo Colon-Santana

Art Unit

2837

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 September 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/26/2006
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Individual Patent Application
6) ☒ Other: Detailed Action

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 6/26/2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because the blank rectangular boxes and/or merely numbered boxes of figures 3 and 7 must be labeled. Conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation (i.e., a labeled rectangular box). See 37 CFR 1.83(a). It is further pointed out that merely numbering the boxes is not considered an appropriate label. Structural elements which can be understood by conventional graphical drawing elements are not required to be labeled. Electronic elements in a "black box" require consulting the text of the specification and thus require labeling. If the box is too small to label, an appropriate label with an arrow pointing towards the box is acceptable. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid

abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. Figures 6 and 7 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed

of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds more than 150 words and is not a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent application. Extensive mechanical and design details of the apparatus or method should not be given. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Observation

6. Regarding claim 2, the word "for" is preceded by the word "member" in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. The examiner will determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, the phrase "in such a case" and "in the case that" in line 10 and 11 respectively, renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakurai et al. PCT Pub. No. WO 01/74700.

U.S. Patent No. 6,700,347 is the equivalent National Stage for Publication No. WO 01/74700 to Sakurai et al. and is being use as a translation in the rejection.

Referring to claim 2, Sakurai et al. discloses a speed varying device (see figures 1, 2a, 2b, 3 and respective portions of the specification. Sakurai et al. further depicts from figures 1 or 3, an induction motor (26) being controlled in an acceleration manner, constant speed manner and a deceleration manner by an open loop control type inverter (23), wherein the speed varying device includes a control means (3a or 3b) for adjusting and correcting (13) the speed, wherein a means for inputting a distance (start command and deceleration stop command) is input to the control part (see Col. 3, lines 39-44) when a motor is decelerated. Furthermore, Sakurai et al. depicts means (11, 12 and 23) for driving a constant speed see figure (2a or 4a) at an intermediate frequency (fout1) so that a previously distance becomes equal to an elevating distance when deceleration at the constant deceleration speed from an arbitrary frequency (fout1 or fout2) is adjusted for the elevating distance and automatically decelerating (h1) the motor after the distance has been adjusted (see Col. 5, line 55 to Col.8, line 67). However, although Sakurai et al. discloses that the control method at the time of deceleration of a variable speed apparatus is suitable for use in application for making a stop in a constant position like an elevator (see Col. 12, lines 61-63), there is not an explicit teaching that an elevator passenger car reaches a deceleration starting position located at a constant

distance from an arriving floor position so as provide the means to calculate the previous distance and control the speed to adjust the elevating distance (leveling). Nevertheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the distance calculated and the leveling frequency adjusted by the elevating distance since a person of ordinary skill would have good reason to pursue Sakurai's teaching as shown in figure 9, that the stop positions of the first thru the fifth floor, in order to make a stop in a stop position of each floor with accuracy (leveling) a moving distance at the time of deceleration from the deceleration start to the deceleration completion needs to be kept constant regardless of an operating frequency at a point in time of a deceleration stop command (see Col. 3, line 39 to Col. 4 line 55).

As to claim 1, the method steps are obvious to the product structure of claim 2 above.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record in form 892 and not specifically relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure to further show the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eduardo Colon-Santana whose telephone number is (571)272-2060. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Benson can be reached on (571) 272-

2800 X.37. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eduardo Colon-Santana/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2837

/ECS/
February 18, 2009

/T C Patel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2839